

The Classical Weekly

Published on Monday, October 1 to May 31, except in weeks in which there is a legal or school holiday (Columbus Day, Election Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas, New Year's Day, Lincoln's Birthday, Washington's Birthday, Easter Sunday, Decoration Day). A volume usually contains twenty-six or twenty-seven issues.

Owner and Publisher, The Classical Association of the Atlantic States.

Place of publication, Barnard College, New York, New York.
Editor, Charles Knapp (Barnard College, Columbia University).
Address, 1737 Sedgwick Avenue, New York, New York.

VOLUME XXIX, No. 21

MONDAY, APRIL 20, 1936 •

WHOLE No. 793

THE LITERARY TASTES OF THE YOUNGER PLINY¹

The man who is known, as Pliny the Younger is, almost entirely from his correspondence is a man to whom we feel entitled to look for expressions of his preferences in literature. A scrutiny of the letters of Pliny, however, discloses very few statements of his specific preferences and tastes in reading. Generalizations, with which he is liberal, do not declare his tastes, and could not be taken as reliable indications that he had any deep sensitiveness to literary values.

Because some of Pliny's letters treat specific literary matters and because some of his friends became conspicuous in literary history, it is our habit to think of him as a literary figure. Pliny was, it is true, fully aware that he was living among persons and events worth literary treatment. He had the polish and the urbane equilibrium which we associate with literary cultivation. As his correspondence shows, he enjoyed the rare and enviable gift of communicating his friendliness. Still, however deeply we admire his unique epistolary talent, we must avoid the mistake of considering Pliny a literary man. Writing and reading got only a fraction of Pliny's widely distributed interest. Barely thirty of his 368 extant letters are on literary subjects. He shared literary interests with only 39 men of the 323 with whom his correspondence is concerned.

To young men who aspired to enter public life and to those who had ambitions at the bar Pliny was uniformly and uncritically encouraging². He was likewise encouraging to young writers and, in letters to their friends or to themselves, expressed friendly optimism over every worthy effort. In this conduct he was aware that he was following the example of Cicero, but there was no illustrious model by whom Pliny could justify his admission that he was inclined to overrate the accomplishments of men whom he liked³.

The waiving of critical standards in favor of friends or of the immature was characteristic of Pliny's amiable nature, but on a third score it was mere lack of logic that impaired his judgment. He considered great productivity a mark of merit. Baebius Macer provided the occasion which brought this fallacy most conspicuously to light. By asking for a complete list of the works of Pliny's celebrated uncle he gave an opportunity for exuberant encomium that would imperil any devoted nephew's critical balance. Pliny's reply, one of the

longest literary memorabilia written in antiquity, shows him at first affecting a disinterested coolness, dismissing his uncle's literary talent and investigative spirit with disparaging succinctness. Then he turns to a description of his uncle's incredible industry⁴, which dominates three-fourths of the letter in a rising tone of enthusiasm. Productivity was, in this case as elsewhere, Pliny's chief criterion of excellence. He was proud that the list of his uncle's compositions was long and varied. This unreasoning approval of mass-production was usually a factor in Pliny's estimates of literary values.

Pliny's friends included a remarkable number of men whose literary abilities made them immortal. His letters have more occasion to mention his social and professional relationships with these men than to evaluate their works, but, when his comments touch writing ability, they are fair and considered. His letters to Tacitus⁵, for instance, and references to him in other letters⁶ pertain usually to their common political, forensic, or social activities, but sometimes to literary interests. Each now and then submitted a work to the other for criticism⁷. Recognizing his friend's superior genius and assured fame, Pliny was proud that their names were sometimes linked together in literary discourses⁸. He was grateful that the fame of his two benefactors, his uncle and Verginius Rufus, was to rest on compositions of Tacitus⁹. These statements (and a few others like them¹⁰) sound like echoes of many hours of conversation in which the literary interests of the two friends sometimes, as in their letters, crowded legal concerns and statesmen's problems into the background.

Pliny's unrestrained admiration for the orations of Tacitus tempts the reader to look in the letters for an estimate of the other works. There is no sign that Pliny associated his friend with the *Dialogus De Oratoribus*, and he refers only vaguely to the *Historiae*. In the earliest of his letters to Tacitus (advising him to take a stylus and tablets when he goes hunting), Pliny speaks as if he were himself an established writer from whom an ambitious tyro would welcome advice on literary methods¹¹, although in fact Pliny in early youth was striving zealously to emulate the genius of Tacitus and to follow him *longo, sed proximo intervallo*¹². In letters

¹3.5-7-8. Compare 5.8.5.

²1.6, 1.20, 4.13, 6.9, 6.16, 6.20, 7.20, 7.33, 8.7, 9.10, 9.14.

³2.1.6, 2.11.2, 17, 19, 4.15.1, 9.23.2-3.

⁴7.20.1-2, 8.7.1.

⁵9.23.2-3. More emphatic, but less explicit, is 7.20.5, a passage which provokes caustic comment from J. W. Mackail, *Latin Literature*, 226 (New York, Scribner, 1895). A more judicious attitude is shown by Elmer Truesdell Merrill, *Selected Letters of Pliny* ("Corrected Impression"), 353 (London, Macmillan, 1927).

⁶2.1.6, 6.16.1-3.

⁷1.6.3, 1.20.24, 2.11.2, 4.13.1-2, 6.16.22, 7.20.5, 7.33.10, 9.10.2-3.

⁸1.6.1-3.

⁹See 7.20.4. Pliny is quoting Vergil, *Aeneid* 5.320.

¹This paper was read at the Twenty-eighth Annual Meeting of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, held at Lafayette College, Easton, Pennsylvania, April 26-27, 1935.

²See, for example, 3.8, 4.4, 6.6, 6.23, 10.12.

³See 3.15.1, 6.17.5-6, 7.28, 8.24.10.

composed probably soon after the publication of the *Historiae* of Tacitus the word *historia* occurs with a frequency suggesting, but not proving explicitly, that Pliny had his friend's work in mind. His uncle's death was to be reported to posterity in some such book¹³, and Pliny would like a similar account of some of his own important public undertakings¹⁴. Twice he compliments Tacitus on historical accuracy¹⁵, and in one letter he pays a graceful compliment to his ability to select just the right materials for a history¹⁶. Yet a little later Pliny is exhorting Tacitus in words which seem to mean that they have both always been engaged in identical activities. Before the publication of the *Annales*, then, Pliny thought of Tacitus as being, like himself, only a lawyer with some reputation as a *raconteur*, putting into another form the same kind of material that he himself was publishing in his letters, and it was appropriate for him to call attention to the common motive of their anecdotes: . . . *pergamus modo itinere instituto, quod ut paucos in lucem famamque provexit, ita multos e tenebris et silentio protulit*¹⁷.

Quintilian was a favorite lecturer whom Pliny often heard¹⁸, but there is not a word in the letters about Quintilian's great treatise. Pliny liked a feature or two of Martial's verses, and, although he felt that their popularity was only ephemeral, he marveled at the work that was expended on them¹⁹. The works of Suetonius appealed to Pliny, but in urging him to publish some of them Pliny's manner was that of a lawyer protecting a copyright without a thought of fostering literary genius²⁰. Pliny found Silius Italicus an excellent conversationalist, but his poetry dull²¹; in this case Pliny's taste proved more accurate than that of his contemporaries²².

On none of these men whom literary history has acclaimed did Pliny express extravagant eulogistic opinions. It is not Quintilian or Martial, Suetonius or Tacitus whom Pliny is suspected of unduly encouraging and overestimating. He reserved his eulogies for those contemporaries of meager endowments whose works no longer exist²³. Pliny was not ashamed to acknowledge a partiality for the works of his friends²⁴. If anyone but Pliny had written some of his praises, they would be accepted as flattery, falsehoods, or jests. But, being Pliny's, they are taken seriously and held up as evidence of his unselective tastes.

One of the most suspicious cases is Arrius Antoninus, who was consul first at about the time of Pliny's debut, grandfather of one Emperor, and boon companion of another²⁵. Because no one but Pliny speaks of his poetic talent, it is assumed that he had none, that Pliny

grossly exaggerated in complimenting his verses²⁶. The compliments are in tone and language so extravagant that they could be addressed only to a man of modest ability whose hobby of composing verses was respected in a society in which it was considered merely polite to flatter old gentlemen on their amateur versifying. Pliny had some reason for writing Antoninus a letter of congratulation on his administration in Asia; half of it he filled with untempered praises of some epigrams and mimes written in Greek 'more Attic than even Athens wrote'²⁷. This outburst is matched by three written later²⁸, but it is not to be thought that Antoninus read these compliments very closely. They were euphemistic expressions of gratitude, probably for a political favor. They sound extravagant, but they say very little. Not one of Pliny's statements is meant to go beyond what we know of Antoninus from an independent source; he showed the blunt wit and the verbal facility of a mime or an epigram when his friend Nerva was made Emperor²⁹. Others came to offer their congratulations, but Antoninus, with brilliant burlesque, extended his condolences and declared that the congratulations should go to the public, to the Senate, to the provinces, to everyone but Nerva.

Perhaps Pliny's treatment of another writer was more representative of his dealings with the ungifted. A stranger sent him for perusal and criticism a book which Pliny had not time to read thoroughly. He read only enough of it to second the author's professed intention of rewriting it³⁰.

Unless, then, we take seriously some congratulatory flattery which Pliny expected no one to take seriously, we have learned only that Pliny, fond of literature in the abstract, respected all efforts and aspirations to produce it, and that he was somewhat selective in his evaluation of the product of even illustrious contemporaries. Statements on the literature which was already classical in his time are not only rare in the letters, but unrevealing, and, as often as not, either disrespectful or disparaging of the Classics.

For example, the definite references which he makes to historians convey no feeling of appreciation. Thucydides and Xenophon he cites in quoting from them, two words from one³¹, and three words from the other³². Cornelius Nepos is named twice. Pliny puts him among the four Roman writers whose celebrity makes one forget that they were not of senatorial rank³³, and his name appears again when one of Pliny's friends is hunting a portrait of him³⁴. Livy's name is seen likewise in two letters, for Pliny tells the story of the provincial who made a pilgrimage all the way from Spain just to look once upon Livy³⁵, and it was a volume of Livy which Pliny happened to be reading at the time of the

¹³16.1.¹⁴7.33.2-3.¹⁵6.20.20.¹⁶9.14.1.¹⁷6.16.1, 7.33.10.¹⁸6.20.20.¹⁹9.14.1.²⁰2.14.9, 6.6.3.²¹3.21.1, 6.²²5.10 (11).²³3.7.4-5.²⁴See, for example, Martial 4.14, 7.63.²⁵For example, Caninius Rufus (1.3.3-4, 8.4), Saturninus (1.16.1-5), Octavius (2.10), Voconius Romanus (2.13.7), Silius Proculus (3.15), Novius Maximus (4.20), Calpurnius Piso (5.17), and Vergilius Romanus (6.21.2-7). Compare Constantine E. Prichard and Edward R. Bernard, *Selected Letters of Pliny*, New Edition, 6 (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1899).²⁶See 7.28.1-2. The effectiveness of Pliny's encouragement is commented on by Hugh M. Kingery, *Selected Letters of Pliny*, 16 (Chicago, Scott, Foresman and Co., 1911).²⁷See E. Groag and A. Stein, *Prosopographia Imperii Romani Saec. I. II. III, Pars I*, 1086 (Berlin, Walter de Gruyter, 1933).²⁸4.3.2-5. Compare F. Skutsch, *Der Jüngere Plinius Ueber Herodas*, *Hermes* 27 (1892), 317-318.²⁹4.3.5. . . non mediis fidius ipsas Athenas tam Atticas dixerim . . .³⁰4.18.1-2, 4.27.5, 5.15 (10). 1-2.³¹Épître De Caesaribus 12.3.³²30.35.³³Pliny quotes Thucydides in 5.8.11. Pliny's Greek quotations have been suspected of coming from some such compendium as that of Pseudo-Longinus. See Anne-Marie Guillemin, *Pliny et la Vie Littéraire de son Temps*, 77-78 (Paris, Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres", 1929).³⁴Xenophon is quoted in 7.32.2.³⁵3.6.³⁶4.28.1.³⁷2.3.8.

eruption of Vesuvius³⁶. In none of these remarks is there more than a hint that Pliny had any reason for liking or admiring the works of these authors. He makes many general allusions to history in his letters. Once he voices a rudimentary theory of historical composition³⁷, but he offers no telling evidence of discrimination in his reading of the established historians.

On tragic poets Pliny is completely silent, unless we note his inclusion of Ennius and Accius among the four Roman writers who were not senators³⁸. One of his friends wrote tragedies³⁹, and he confesses to a juvenile essay in the art on his own part⁴⁰. He was proud of his cleverness in naming his lakeside villa Tragoedia because it stood on a cliff as if wearing a buskin⁴¹. But no great Attic dramatist is even named, except in an explanation of the slang use of the name of Sophocles⁴². Comic writers fare even worse, for Pliny names them only to their discredit. Menander was the model for the plays of one of Pliny's poetaster friends⁴³. Herondas is grudgingly admitted to have been supreme in mimes; Pliny makes the admission for the sake of showing that Antoninus is superior to him in the epigram⁴⁴. Plautus and Terence were the models for one of Pliny's friends⁴⁵ and, with a difference, for the accomplished wife of another⁴⁶, whose preference for prose over verse set her off from the ancients.

Seneca's name stands in a letter with twenty other famous names to help Pliny make a case for the moribund institution of authors' recitals⁴⁷. Lucan's name was once in this list, but a recent editor (Schuster) has rescued him on textual grounds⁴⁸. Horace is recipient of only a 'left-handed compliment' which, however, suggests real appreciation of his metrical versatility and fluency. If such talents are transmitted by heredity, then surely the blood of Horace runs in the veins of Passennus Paulus⁴⁹, whose kinship with Propertius is responsible for Pliny's only references to that poet⁵⁰.

Two letters introduce the name of Catullus with a trace of discernment. Pliny, after listing four features of his poetry (and that of Calvus) which it was conventional to admire, adds one which argues for his genuine appreciation. Not only the grace, harmony, passion, and tenderness of the poems appealed to Pliny, but also their studied interpolations of harshness, in which Pliny, characteristically, found one of his friends superior to Catullus⁵¹. He speaks of Catullus again in justifying the use of improprieties in poetry⁵². A third occasion to name him comes with the report of some one who rated Pliny's talent above that of Catullus⁵³.

A trite three-word phrase is all Pliny has from Luccretius⁵⁴, and it is not ascribed to its author. There are remarks on Homer which assume that every schoolboy knows the great epics⁵⁵. Pliny's three references to Ver-

gil include nothing of interest except a remark on the unique way in which his birthday was celebrated by the idolatrous Silius Italicus⁵⁶. The poet on whom Pliny makes his most appreciative observation is Aratus, who was always a favorite in Rome, but who never won a tribute that rings with more feeling than Pliny's⁵⁷.

In discussing oratory Pliny occasionally introduces names, but in a manner no more illuminating about tastes and preferences than other remarks of his on literary works⁵⁸. Isocrates overcame physical difficulties to become an orator⁵⁹. Asinius Pollio uttered one paradoxical and extravagant apothegm⁶⁰, and M. Antonius one a bit milder⁶¹. Aeschines applied a metaphor to the metaphors of Demosthenes⁶². Such vacuities would seem to sum up Pliny's whole exercise of critical thinking about the world's greatest practitioners of his own profession, if we trusted only Pliny's specific statements and drew no inferences from his usage or from his unintentional reflections of his reading. On the orators, it happens, supplementary evidence is available to demonstrate convincingly which of them Pliny liked to read. Fifteen snatches from the oratory of Demosthenes illustrate points in Pliny's discussions⁶³. He shows eight similar reflections of his interest in Aeschines⁶⁴, but never an echo of other Attic orators. It is when we observe that Demosthenes and Aeschines are usually cited together that we are made to feel that they stood together in Pliny's mind, that he must have enjoyed reading them together, and that Aeschines was almost as great a favorite with him as Demosthenes was.

One or two similar cautious explorations in the dim alleys of literary suggestion will bring other clues to show that Pliny had tastes more discriminating than his statements reveal. His habits of reading and excerpting were so exceptional that we feel justified in examining the accrued sediment of all his conning and learning to find help in analyzing his tastes. We all use the expressions that linger after reading on the fringes of memory more in our letters than in speeches. So it was with Pliny. His long Panegyricus contains barely a dozen echoes of his reading. In his letters they are sprinkled everywhere, numerous enough and suggestive enough to permit some deductions and comparisons⁶⁵.

³⁶3.7.1. See also 5.3.6 and 5.6.43. An excellent imaginative description of this celebration was written by Professor George Meason Whicher, *Vergiliana*, 23-31 (Amherst, The Bookmart, 1931).

³⁷5.6.43.

³⁸J. W. H. Atkins, *Literary Criticism in Antiquity*, 1.237, 304-308 (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1934), and J. F. D'Aiton, *Roman Literary Theory and Criticism*, 339 (London, Longmans, 1931), both discuss Pliny's tastes and standards in oratory. The former concludes with an evaluation of Pliny's critique (308): "... in actual literary criticism he cannot be said to rank very high. His theorizing, it is true, is devoid of neither sense nor sensibility; though... it consists mainly of orthodox teaching, and of those neatly turned platitudes in which he delighted. And as for his judgments, they are for the most part superficial and conventional in kind; they do little more than reflect the current opinions of the time—perhaps all that could be expected of epistolary writings. Such results, it is obvious, are not the marks of the highest critic; yet they have their value in critical history".

³⁹6.29.6.

⁴⁰5.20.5.

⁴¹9.26.9.

⁴²3.10, 4.7.6, 9.26.8 (four passages), 9.26.9 (nine passages).

⁴³2.3.10, 9.26.9, 9.26.11 (three passages), 9.26.12 (three passages).

⁴⁴Guillemin, 152-153 (see note 31, above), treats very briefly the frequency and the character of Pliny's "souvenirs" and borrowings. In his review of her book Wilhelm Ax, *Philologische Wochenschrift* 50 (1930), 740-748, expresses approval of interpreting Pliny's tastes from the reflections of his reading. Conclusive remarks on certain of Pliny's reading habits were based on a survey of his direct quo-

⁴⁵1.16.5.

⁴⁶4.14.5.

⁴⁷4.27.4.

⁴⁸4.18.1.

⁴⁹See, for example, 1.20.22, 4.3.3, 5.19.2, 5.20.8.

³⁶20.5. ³⁷5.8.9-11. ³⁸5.3.6. ³⁹7.17.11.
⁴⁰7.4.2. ⁴¹9.7.3. ⁴²2.14.5. ⁴³6.21.4.
⁴⁴3.4. ⁴⁵2.1.4. ⁴⁶1.16.6. ⁴⁷5.3.5.
⁴⁸Compare R. C. Kükula, *C. Plinii Secundi Epistularum Libri Novem*, ... 123 (Leipzig, Teubner, 1923), with M. Schuster, *C. Plinii Secundi Epistularum Libri Novem*, ... 145 (Leipzig, Teubner, 1933).

⁴⁹2.2.2. ⁵⁰6.15.1, 9.22.1-2.
⁵¹1.16.5. One commentator translates the four admired characteristics thus: "what strokes of wit, what sweetness of numbers, what pointed satire, what touches of the tender passion!" See J. H. Westcott, *Selected Letters of Pliny*, 146 (Boston, Allyn and Bacon, 1898).

⁵²4.14.5. ⁵³4.27.4. ⁵⁴4.18.1.

⁵⁵See, for example, 1.20.22, 4.3.3, 5.19.2, 5.20.8.

In reminiscences of Cicero particularly can the hints be taken to supplement the outright allusions to Cicero. The letters of Pliny have only a few words quoted verbatim from Cicero, but they refer to him on a number of topics, especially on oratory. He was to Pliny's mind the orator supreme, to be both imitated and revered⁶⁶. Pliny would copy even his rhetorical details⁶⁷. When he sought models for the difficult art of expressing charges concisely, Pliny found them in two speeches of Cicero, *Pro Murena* and *Pro Vareno*⁶⁸. For another purpose it was Cicero's copiousness that appealed to him⁶⁹. Election to the College of Augurs delighted Pliny especially because Cicero once served on it⁷⁰. Almost all Pliny's remarks about Cicero concern his speeches, but by no means all Pliny's references to Cicero carry formal ascriptions. One editor⁷¹ finds 53 resemblances or reminiscences; a fifth of these recall points in Cicero's *De Officiis* and almost half of them resemble passages in philosophical essays, while only three of Cicero's rhetorical treatises are thus recalled. Eleven speeches have similar evidence of Pliny's interest, and in six places his words are parallel to passages in letters to Atticus⁷². These letters received more of Pliny's attention than the letters *Ad Familiares*, to which he would certainly have turned if he had been merely seeking models for his own diversified correspondence. In addition to an unmistakable assurance of Pliny's habit of reading Cicero, we see in these parallel passages a strong suggestion that his affection for the contemplative essayist outweighed his admiration of the practical orator whom he happens so often to cite by name that we can be misled into thinking that this was the only Cicero for

whom he cared. When Pliny read Cicero for enjoyment, he turned to the philosophical discourses, in particular those which stress ethical values. When Pliny studied Cicero professionally, he took up both the technical manuals and the actual speeches, very likely to consider each in the light of the other.

Pliny's reflections of his reading are useful in correcting other wrong impressions which his specific statements inspire. It is notable that Pliny calls the *Iliad* to his reader's mind nineteen times and the *Odyssey* only six times⁷³. His habit of using Vergilian tags shows so great a preference for the *Aeneid* over the other poems that it is seen to have been second only to the *Iliad* in his esteem⁷⁴. He also reflects Hesiod, Ennius, and Lucretius, but his recollections of Lucan are as numerous as the total of all three⁷⁵. The epic poems which Pliny knew best were the *Iliad*, the *Aeneid*, and the *Pharsalia*.

Among historians, too, Pliny's echoes suggest distinct preferences quite unlike the vagueness of his overt statements. His mind harbored Thucydides four times as retentively as either Xenophon or Herodotus⁷⁶. Caesar's military annals and some minor Latin historians were among his reading, but he was devoted to two historians, Sallust and Livy⁷⁷. His preference, especially in later life, was apparently for Livy.

Although his outright allusions to dramatic writers make Pliny seem almost illiterate about them, there is evidence in unlabeled allusions to prove him a reader of drama with pronounced tastes. He quotes from three plays of Euripides without naming him⁷⁸. He refers to Eupolis in quoting him⁷⁹, but, when he quotes Aristophanes, he feels no need of a name⁸⁰. His appreciative recollections of Plautus and Terence belie his slighting references to them. Eleven of his eighteen reminiscences

tations from Greek authors by Sidney N. Deane, *The Greek in Pliny's Letters*, *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 12 (1918), 41-44, 50-54. Professor Deane establishes (1) the comparative frequency of Greek terms in letters on literary subjects, (2) the sincerity of Pliny's interest in his friends' Greek compositions, (3) a classification of isolated Greek expressions, and (4) Pliny's intimacy with Homeric epic, Euripides, Thucydides, and Demosthenes, and then concludes (54) that Pliny's reading was perhaps "more Greek than Latin".

⁶⁶1.20.4-7, 7.17.13.
⁶⁷1.2.4, 1.3.11-12, 9.26.8. Conscious imitation of Cicero in Pliny's *Panegyricus* has been discussed by G. Sustei, *De Plinio Ciceronis Imitatore*, *Rivista di Filologia e d'Istoria* 13 (1890), 74-76.

⁶⁸1.20.7, ⁶⁹1.20.4, 9.2.2, ⁷⁰4.8.2.
⁷¹M. Schuster (see note 48, above). In Schuster's edition of Pliny the marking of parallel expressions has clearly received considerable attention. Almost all the reminiscences which he allows agree with comments of other editors, notably Prichard and Bernard (see note 23, above). J. H. Westcott (see note 31, above), Elmer Truesdell Merrill (see note 8, above), and G. B. Allen, *Selected Letters of Pliny* (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1915). This discussion is limited to passages marked by Schuster. The following list shows the passages in Pliny and Cicero which he finds parallel:

1.9.8:	De Officiis	3.1	1.2.4:	Ad Atticum	1.14.3	1.3.2:	Brutus	274
1.12.11:	"	1.57	1.11.1:	"	4.8a.4	1.20.17:	"	38, 59
1.18.5:	"	1.30	3.9.3:	"	8.2.3	5.8.10:	"	68
2.20.2:	"	3.74	3.9.28:	"	1.16.1	7.20.4:	"	173
5.3.2:	"	1.30	5.2.2:	"	6.1.22	8.21.6:	"	288
6.20.7:	"	2.74	10.75.2:	"	11.2.1	1.20.17:	De Oratore	3.138
7.12.1:	"	1.81	9.1.3:	Ad Fam.	3.6.6	2.3.10:	"	3.213
7.27.5:	"	3.55	5.8.8:	Philippica	12.3	4.5.1:	"	1.152
8.24.6:	"	2.23	8.24.2:	"	2.39	7.4.10:	"	2.104
8.24.8:	"	3.6	3.9.8:	Pro Placco	92	7.17.13:	"	1.150
9.18.1:	"	3.112	8.24.2:	"	62	4.3.5:	Orator	23
2.10.2:	Tus. Dis.	1.116	2.1.2:	Pro Planco	60	5.6.44:	"	14
8.16.1:	"	1.116	Pan. 94.3:	"	8	Panegyricus 20.3:	"	10
9.23.5:	"	5.103	1.5.14:	Pro Domo	48	5.8.11:	Topica	74
4.18.1:	De Finibus	1.10	1.20.10:	In Verrem	2.4.5			
5.8.8:	"	5.43	6.13.1:	Pro Milone	5			
10.110.2:	Academica	2.99	8.13.3:	Pro Quintio	54			
7.4.10:	De Divinatione	1.80	Pan. 49.3:	In Pisonem	59			
Pan. 20.6:	De Natura Deorum	1.17	Pan. 94.3:	In Catilinam	2.2, 3.1			
6.12.3:	Laelius	97						

⁷²Guillemin, 113-132 (see note 31, above), considers certain Ciceronian reminiscences not merely conscious on Pliny's part, but indicative of a systematic effort to reproduce the phrasing of his models, the letters of Cicero.

⁷³1.20.15, 4.11.9, 4.27.6.

⁷⁴1.20.17.

⁷⁵1.20.19.

of drama are from Latin comedy⁸¹, surely a mark of preference. He must also have liked Seneca's Thyestes, for twice he imitated its phrasing⁸².

Pliny barely mentions the name of Seneca, but he shows his familiarity with almost all his works. In fact, it seems that Seneca's essays were almost as well known as Cicero's to Pliny, and that he reviewed *De Clementia* while he was composing his *Panegyricus*⁸³. As Pliny shows no evidence of interest in Greek writers of philosophy⁸⁴, it is apparent that his reading in philosophy favored Latin writers, Cicero and Seneca above all.

The appreciation of Horace which Pliny masked in a frivolous comparison is established and even fortified by a glance at Pliny's seventeen echoes of his poems⁸⁵. While not unappreciative of the metrical variety of the *Odes*⁸⁶, Pliny read over and over and in his own writing reflected Horace's *Sermones* and *Epistulae*, which twelve of his expressions recall. Although Pliny speaks of Catullus three times, he uses no phrase or thought borrowed from his poems. A single echo suggests Tibullus⁸⁷, but there is no similar hint of regard for Propertius. It is a poet never even named in the letters who ranked next to Homer and Vergil in Pliny's taste. Nine allusions are strong enough to show Pliny a devoted reader of Ovid⁸⁸, from whose *Tristia*, *Fasti*, *Metamorphoses*, *Heroides*, and *Ars Amatoria* he drew expressions and figures to carry his own ideas and feelings. For example, when Pliny wished to show his friend Maximus, recently appointed to the province of Achaia, that a unique responsibility was involved in the governing of this province, there came to his mind an elaborate paraphrase of the words with which Ovid's Helen reminds Paris of his responsibility⁸⁹. The reminiscence conveys the sentimental touch which Pliny wished his congratulations to have.

Bringing together the lessons of Pliny's statements and the implications of his allusions provides a far more satisfactory view of Pliny's tastes in literature than we could otherwise have. We see, first of all, a hearty respect for literary fecundity, especially when he found it in a relative or in a friend; he was discreet in his comments on famous contemporaries, but inclined to be extravagant about the merits of aspiring amateurs, if they were at all competent. He admired the orations of Tacitus, the wit and the technical skill of Martial, and an occasional feature of some other work. Pliny was sparing in his comments on the Classics, but he knew well and respected Cicero's oratory and philosophy. He liked to read Seneca even to the neglect of Plato. He enjoyed Aratus, and had distinct preferences among the works of Horace and Ovid. Although the *Iliad*

and the *Aeneid* were constantly in his thoughts, he spent some pleasant hours over Lucan. Sallust, Livy, Thucydides, Demosthenes, Aeschines, and Cicero were objects of serious study, and he found delightful relaxation in reading Plautus and Terence.

Most letters written for publication have been richer in pronouncements of literary likes and dislikes than those of Pliny. But no letter-writers could provide us with sounder evidence that their reading and study were thorough and deep. Pliny, in his youth, was schooled in intensive literary and language studies. When we to-day admire the habits and the standards which he gained through those studies, it strengthens our conviction that such studies must not be neglected in the training of our youth.

THE UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

JAMES STINCHCOMB

QUEM DEUS VULT PERDERE DEMENTAT PRIUS

The proverb *Quem deus vult perdere dementat prius* is quoted with a great many variations, most of which may be represented as follows:

Quem deus vult perdere dementat prius.
Quos Jupiter perdere vult prius dementat.

Other variations are *Quem vult perdere Jupiter dementat prius*, and, in French authors, *Quos vult perdere deus (or Jupiter) dementat*. These are not the only forms.

The fundamental assumption of the authorities is that this proverb is a Latin version of a Greek tragic distich (*Fragmenta Adespota* 455, in August Nauck, *Fragmenta Tragicorum Graecorum*² [Leipzig, Teubner, 1889]):

ὅταν δ' ὁ δαίμων ἀνδρὶ πορσύνῃ κακά,
τὸν νοῦν ἐβλάψῃ πρῶτον ᾧ βουλευέται.

This couplet is found in the scholia to Sophocles, *Antigone* 620, and, with omission of δ' and the last two words, in Athenagoras, *Supplicatio Pro Christianis*, Chapter 26, § 129. The passage in Athenagoras is certainly the source from which the Greek couplet was drawn by Joshua Barnes and James Duport, whose treatments will be discussed below.

The only other ancient passage which has a direct bearing on the wording of our proverb is one of the *sententiae* of Publilius Syrus, *Stultum facit Fortuna quem vult perdere*³.

Until I discovered Sir Richard Jebb's comments⁴

¹In Stephanus's edition of Athenagoras, this δ', which is essential to the meter, is inserted. Since this was no doubt the edition used by Barnes and Duport, we can understand the presence of δ' in the latter, of δέ in the former. Barnes states that Athenagoras is his source.

²This *sententia* may be found in various editions of Publilius Syrus. It is No. 612 in Otto Friedrich, *Publili Syri Mimi Sententiae* (Berlin, Theobald Grieben, 1880); No. 610 in A. Spengel, *Publili Syri Sententiae* (Berlin, Weidmann, 1874), and in Wilhelm Meyer, *Publili Syri Mimi Sententiae* (Leipzig, Teubner, 1880); and No. 671 in J. Wight Duff and Arnold M. Duff, *Minor Latin Poets*, a volume of The Loeb Classical Library (1934).

³R. C. Jebb, *Sophocles, The Plays and Fragments, With Critical Notes, Commentary, and Translation in English Prose, Part III, The Antigone*² (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1891). The passage quoted is from the Appendix, pages 255-256, and is a comment on the note to verse 622.

⁴By quoting so fully the views of the various 'authorities', Mr Householder has enabled his readers to engage in a very interesting study. One sees how insecure are the foundations on which some

⁸¹For Plautus see 4.29.1, 6.20.12, 7.27.4-6, 8.24.2, 9.18.1. For Terence see 4.29.1, 5.3.2, 6.16.11, 7.12.1, 9.12.1, *Panegyricus* 94.3, 96.20.15, 8.16.5.

⁸²For references to *De Clementia* see *Panegyricus* 49.3, 80.3, 83.1, 88.4. For other works of Seneca see 1.20.18, 1.22.10, 2.8.2, 2.17.9, 4.18.2, 5.9.6, 5.17.6, 5.19.2, 6.12.3, 6.20.17, 6.32.1, 8.14.10, 8.22.1, 8.22.3, 9.33.11, *Panegyricus* 20.6, 31.1, 40.1, 68.2, 85.2.

⁸³Professor Deane, 53 (see note 65, above), finds "very faint" traces of an interest in Greek philosophical literature.

⁸⁴1.9.2, 1.15.2, 2.20.2, 3.5.4, 3.9.8, 4.7.3, 6.8.6, 6.10.2, 7.4.10, 7.5.1 (two passages), 7.31.4, 8.17.2, 8.24.2, 9.12.1, *Panegyricus* 31.1, 68.7.

⁸⁵9.22.2. ⁸⁶9.13.15.

⁸⁷3.9.55, 4.14.5, 5.1.11, 8.4.2, 8.16.5, 8.24.8, *Panegyricus* 85.1, 85.2, 86.4.

⁸⁸*Heroides* 17.167.

on Sophocles, *Antigone* 622, I was unwilling to believe that any one—except such men as edit collections of proverbs—could regard the Latin proverb under discussion as a translation of the Greek couplet quoted above. Jebb's comment runs as follows:

The Greek verses given in the note <on verse 622, page 120>, *ὅταν δ' ὁ δαίμων, κ.τ.λ.*, were probably the original of 'Quem Iuppiter vult perdere, dementat prius.' They are cited, with this Latin verse added in brackets, by James Duport... in his *Gnomologia Homerica* (Cambridge, 1660), p. 282. He is illustrating *Od.* 23.11, *μάρτυρ σε θεοὶ θέσαν*. Joshua Barnes, in the 'Index prior' to his *Euripides* (Camb., 1694), has, 'Deus quos vult perdere, dementat prius, incerta v. 436.' On that verse itself, p. 515, another version is given, viz., 'At quando numen miserias paret viro, Mens laesa primum.' And in the margin he cites 'Franciados nostrae' v. 3, 'certe ille deorum Arbiter ulticem cum vult extendere dextram Dementat prius.' It was suggested to me that the line 'Quem Iuppiter' etc. had first appeared in Canter's *Euripides*. I have looked through both the editions, but without finding it. His duodecimo ed. (Antwerp, 1571) has an appendix of 16 pages, 'Euripidis sententiae aliquot insigniores breviter collectae, et Latinis versibus redditae': but 'Quem Iuppiter' is not among them. His folio ed. (of 1614) does not seem to contain it either. Publius <*sic*> Syrus 610 has 'stultum facit fortuna quem vult perdere.' This shows that part of the line, at least, was familiar *circa* 50 B. C. The use of *dementat* as = *dementem facit* proves, of course, a post-classical origin.

Let us see what the collectors have to offer.

Arthaber¹ implies that the Latin sentence is a translation of the Greek distich given above. He credits the distich to Sophocles, *Antigone* 620.

Büchmann² refers the Latin line to the same Greek couplet. He compares Publilius Syrus, and Velleius Paterculus 2.118.4³. The latter passage bears no resemblance in wording to our proverb.

Benham⁴ thinks that the Latin proverb is a translation, by Joshua Barnes, of the Greek couplet.

Harbottle⁵ calls the Latin proverb anonymous. He compares Publilius Syrus and Velleius Paterculus 2.118.4.

King⁶ offers practically the same information as Jebb. He cites in addition the note of Malone in Boswell's *Johnson*, which will be discussed below. He asserts that the proverb was translated from the Greek couplet by Duport, and he compares Publilius Syrus and Velleius Paterculus 2.57.3¹⁰.

pronouncements rest. To be made so strikingly aware of this as Mr. Householder's quotations make us is on the one hand to be grievously discouraged: whom are we to trust? On the other hand, the experience is stimulating and really encouraging, first in that it gives us a good lesson in methodology, secondly, in that it helps us to see how much yet remains to be done in the broad field of the Classics, early and late.

Mr. Householder of course quotes exactly, errors and all. C. K. >.
¹Augusto Arthaber, *Dizionario Comparato di Proverbi e Modi Proverbiali*, 634, No. 1266 (Milan, Ulrico Hoepli, Undated).

²Georg Büchmann, *Gefügelte Worte*, Twenty-seventh Edition, Revised by Bogdan Krieger (Berlin, Haude und Spensersche Buchhandlung, M. Paschke, 1925).

³The passage runs as follows: ita se res habet, ut plerumque cui fortunam mutaturus <est> deus consilia corruptat.

⁴W. Gurney Benham, *Cassell's Book of Quotations*, Revised Edition, 648 (London, Cassell and Co., 1914).

⁵Thomas Benfield Harbottle, *Dictionary of Quotations* (Classical), 279 (London, Swan Sonnenschein and Co., 1906).

⁶W. Francis H. King, *Classical and Foreign Quotations*, 298, No. 2359 (London, J. Whitaker and Sons, 1904).

¹⁰This passage runs as follows: Sed profecto ineluctabilis fatorum vis, cuiuscumque fortunam mutare constituit, consilia corruptit.

Ramage¹¹ writes as follows:

In a note on a fragment of Euripides there is the following Greek proverb <here he quotes our couplet as Barnes has it>. See Duport's *Gnomologia Homerica*, p. 282. Cantab. 1660. Athenagoras quotes Greek lines, and renders them in Latin (p. 121). Oxon. 1682 <here he quotes Gesner's version of the couplet, given below>.

Walsh¹² writes:

An anonymous translation of a fragmentary line of Greek attributed to Euripides: *ὅς θεὸς θέλει ἀπολέσαι πρῶτ' ἀποφρονεῖ*. Sophocles, however, refers to it (*Antigone*, 622) as a remarkable saying of some one unknown. It appears as Maxim 911 in Publius <*sic*> Syrus in this form: "Whom Fortune wishes to destroy she first makes mad."

Riley¹³ agrees substantially with Benham.

Stevenson¹⁴ gives this misinformation:

Whom the gods destroy, they first make mad. (*ὅς θεὸς θέλει, πρῶτ' ἀποφρονεῖ*.) Euripides, Fragment. (Boswell, *Life of Johnson*, 1783. Note.)

Whom God would destroy, he first makes mad. (Quem deus vult perdere, prius dementat.)

The Latin version of the Greek maxim, based probably on Euripides, though Plutarch (*De Audiend. Poet.*, 106) has preserved the adage as a fragment of Aeschylus.

Whom Jupiter would destroy, he first drives mad. (Quem Iuppiter vult perdere, dementat primus.) Sophocles, *Antigone* (Johnson, tr.)

He also cites Publilius Syrus.

Hoyt's *Cyclopedia*¹⁵ presents a minor masterpiece of confusion.

Quem Jupiter vult perdere, dementat primus.... Sophocles—*Antigone*. Johnson's ed. (1758) L. 632. Sophocles quotes it as a saying. The passage in *Antigone* is explained by Tricinius <*sic*> as "The gods lead to error him whom they intend to make miserable." Quoted by Athenagoras.... Found in a fragment of Aeschylus preserved by Plutarch, *De Audiend. Poet.* P. 63. Oxon ed.

Reference is then made to a number of passages in various works, all, except that in Duport, more or less irrelevant.

Hill¹⁶, in his comment on Edmond Malone's note at the relevant passage of Boswell's *Life of Johnson*, points out the obvious fact that the "Greek Iambick", *ὅς θεὸς θέλει ἀπολέσαι, πρῶτ' ἀποφρονεῖ*, is not from Euripides, or even ancient; in fact, he says, it is hardly Greek at all. He quotes the passage from Barnes's *Euripides*, adding that the *Franciad* is probably Barnes's uncompleted poem on Edward III.

¹¹Craufurd Tait Ramage, *Familiar Quotations from Latin Authors* (London, George Routledge and Sons, Undated), 791, or *Beautiful Thoughts from Latin Authors*, 791 (London, George Routledge and Sons, 1895).

¹²William S. Walsh, *Handy-book of Literary Curiosities*, 937 (Philadelphia, Lippincott, 1893).

¹³H. T. Riley, *A Dictionary of Latin and Greek Quotations, Proverbs, Maxims and Mottoes, Classical and Mediaeval*, 363 (London, George Bell and Sons, 1888).

¹⁴Burton Stevenson, *The Home Book of Quotations*, 1231 (1232), No. 23, 1232, No. 5 (New York, Dodd, Mead and Co., 1934).

¹⁵Hoyt's *New Cyclopedia of Practical Quotations*, Revised and Enlarged by Kate Roberts, 397, 11 (New York, Funk and Wagnalls Co. Undated).

¹⁶Boswell's *Life of Johnson*, Edited by George Birbeck Hill, 4.209, note (New York, Harper, Undated).

The passage in Duport¹⁷ is a note on Homer, *Odyssey* 23.11-13:

μάργην σε θεοὶ θέσαν, οἳ τε δύνανται
ἀφρονα ποιῆσαι καὶ ἐπιφρονά περ μὲν ἴδοντα,
καὶ τε χαλιφρονέοντα σαφροσύνην ἐπέβησαν.

The note, after a discussion of Biblical parallels, and a denial of Meric Casaubon's theory that Homer borrowed the sentiment from the Bible, reads as follows:

Huic porro *Hom.* sententiae, Deum sc. sapientes & insipientes reddere, bonam mentem dare & adimere, & sapientiam inprimis esse Dei donum, passim suffragantur Autores. *Pind.* Ol. 11 <10> 'Ἐκ θεοῦ δ' ἀνὴρ Σοφαὶς ἀνθεὶ Ἰσάει πραπίδεςσι. *Aeschyl.* Agam. <173-177> Ζήνα—τὸν φρονεῖν βροτοὺς δόωσαντα, rursus ib. <927-928> Τὸ μὴ κακῶς φρονεῖν θεοῦ μέγιστον δῶρον. *Eurip.* Supplic. <734-735> ὦ Ζεῦ, τί δῆτα τοὺς τάλαιπῶρους βροτοὺς φρονεῖν λέγουσι; Σοὺ γὰρ ἐξητήμεθα. *Contrā*, 'Ὅταν δ' ὁ δαίμων ἀνδρὶ παρόντη κακὰ, τὸν νοῦν ἐβλάψῃ πρῶτον, (Quem Jupiter vult perdere, dementat prius) h. e. solet ἀφρονα ποιῆσαι καὶ φρενοβλαβῇ.

Several facts make it clear that the Latin in parentheses at the close of the passage just quoted is not an original translation by Duport of the preceding Greek, and was not meant by Duport as a translation at all. First, although Duport does, rarely, translate Greek that he has quoted, his versions are close, are not placed in parentheses, and serve a specific purpose, made evident in each case by the context. Secondly, there are in Duport a few other instances of italicized parenthetical sentences; these are all inserted to illustrate the preceding Greek, and are always quotations. Thirdly, Duport quotes our proverb in another context where there can be no question of translation. On page 234, in note I, a discussion of *Odyssey* 16.278-280, he writes:

Recta monenti non parere, certissimum ruinae praesagium: adeo quibus exitium jam imminet et in parato esse interitus, ii nec nequitiae nuntium remittent, nec salutaribus consiliis obtemperabunt, οὐδὲ παύσονται, οὐδὲ πείσονται. *Quem enim perdere vult Jupiter, dementat prius.*

It is to be observed that here also Duport uses italics, his normal device for indicating that words are not his own. Clearly in both instances he is quoting by way of illustration a Latin gnome which was familiar in his day.

Barnes¹⁸, in his *Index Prior* (page 531), under the letter D, has this entry: "Deus quos vult perdere, dementat prius. *Incerta v. 436.*" *Incerta 436* (on page 515) is, of course, our familiar fragment, given thus:

ὅταν δὲ δαίμων ἀνδρὶ παρόντη κακὰ
τὸν νοῦν ἐβλάψῃ πρῶτον. . . .

Barnes translates the Greek by "At quando Numen miserias paret viro, Mens laesa primum. . . ." In his marginal note, after a number of unimportant references, he says:

Tale quid nos in *Franciados*¹⁹ nostrae l. 3.

Certe ille Deorum

Arbiter ultricem cum vult extendere Dextram,

Dementat prius & nostri confringere vires
Consilii gaudet: Mentis temerarius ardor
Praecurrit poenas; nec enim poena est levis ipsa.

Tale quid Paternulus de Variana clade <2.118.4>.

The *Index Prior*, in which Barnes gives our proverb, is a subject-index which presents the themes of various passages of Euripides, in compact Latin, frequently in the form of familiar proverbs. Certainly Barnes did not intend this entry as a translation, or apprehend it as a translation. The translation he does offer in the text has not a single word in common with the proverb. C. Gesner, in Henricus Stephanus's edition of *Athenagoras*, page 116 (Geneva[?], 1557), offers a Latin translation of the Greek fragment, which resembles Barnes very slightly, and the proverb not at all:

At daemon homini quum struit aliquod malum,
Peruertit illi primitus mentem suam.

We may now attempt to find Duport's source for the proverb. Barnes perhaps drew it from Duport; he cites this very passage of Duport's *Homeri Gnomologia* in his edition of Homer. Duport studied at Westminster School under Dr. John Wilson, and at Trinity College, Cambridge, with Dr. Robert Hitch. In the Introduction to the *Homeri Gnomologia* Duport refers to Justus Lipsius, Julius Caesar Scaliger, Isaac Casaubon, Meric Casaubon, Dominicus Baudius, Claudius Salmasius, Petrus Victorius, Wolfgang Seberus, and Richard Busby. A reasonably careful inspection of the printed works (in most cases voluminous) of these men fails to reveal any thing pertinent to our inquiry. Duport frequently quotes Erasmus's *Adagia*, and he expressly mentions Erasmus's habit of 'hammering' or 'carving' Latin proverbs out of any faintly gnomic Greek quotations. But our adage is not in Erasmus. The *Grammars* in use at Westminster School when Duport was there were William Lily's *Latin Grammar*²⁰, and William Camden's *Greek Grammar*²¹. Neither of these works contains the proverb, although Lily uses many examples from ancient and modern Latin, nearly all of a sententious nature.

One thing is now clear, that the origin of the proverb is earlier than Duport's *Homeri Gnomologia*, how much earlier we can not say. It is later than Publilius Syrus; if we may judge from the use of *dementat*, it is at least four hundred years later. Since it conveys a non-Christian sentiment, a clerical, and hence a medieval origin is doubtful. It may well be that the tragic distich quoted at the outset of this paper had some influence upon its author; but so may any of the half dozen other Greek and Latin passages cited by the 'authorities'.

DRISLER FELLOW IN

CLASSICS,

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

FRED W. HOUSEHOLDER, JR.

¹⁷James Duport, *Homeri Gnomologia Duplici Parallelismo Illustrata*, 282, note A (Cambridge, 1660).

¹⁸Euripidis Quae Extant Omnia: Opera et Studio Josuae Barnes (Cambridge, 1694).

¹⁹The *Franciad* was an unpublished epic poem by Barnes, with Edward, the Black Prince, as its central figure. Twelve books were planned, of which eight were completed. See *Biographia Britannica*, i.493.

²⁰William Lily, *Brevissima Institutio, Seu Ratio Grammaticae Cognoscendae* (London, 1755).

²¹William Camden, Editor, *Institutio Graecae Grammaticae Compendiaria in Usum Regiae Scholae Westmonasteriensis* (London, 1736).

Of course the editions named in this note and note 20, above, are late editions, but their Prefaces declare them to be faithfully printed from the text of the oldest editions.

REVIEWS

Hellas and Hellenism: A Social and Cultural History of Ancient Greece. By Nicholas P. Vlachos. Boston: Ginn and Company (1936). Pp. ix, 428. 30 Illustrations; 3 Maps. \$3.00.

Hellas and Hellenism, the book under review, is intended for the use of the undergraduate and for the pleasure or enlightenment of the general reader. The items of its Bibliography are exclusively English works or translations of foreign books. Its illustrations are those of well-known monuments. It contains nothing that is novel or startling.

The contents of the book are as follows:

Preface (v-vii); Table of Contents (ix); I, Introductory (3-19); II, The Heroic Age (20-60); III, The Transition (61-67); IV, The Political History of Hellas (68-127); V, The City-State (128-145); VI, Religion (146-170); VII, Morality (171-179); VIII, Education (180-198); IX, Poetry (199-277); X, Prose (278-321); XI, Art and Architecture (322-360); XII, Science and Philosophy (361-414); Bibliography (415-418); Index (419-428).

The purpose of the author is clearly stated in the Preface (v):

...to co-ordinate the political, social, and cultural elements of Hellenic history and to present these as so many aspects of what is after all an indivisible whole ...the pertinent facts...are presented as so many social phenomena, serving to illuminate the central problem, the character and the history of the Greek polis.

Dr. Vlachos has thus set himself a difficult task—one that has been attempted by others with varying degrees of success. Even a cursory reading of the book will convince the reader that the author has conducted his work with much zeal and thoroughness and with a mind well equipped for his undertaking. I do not intend for a moment to disparage his method or his objective; but, speaking as a layman, I venture to raise the question whether the theory of the Greek city-state, which took form in the minds of scholars nearly a century ago, is not to-day accepted too much as a matter of course. If the theory were to be reexamined by some scholar who possessed the requisite temerity and learning, who was prepared to carry the matter far

beyond the confines of Athens and Sparta, is it not possible that it might, in journalistic parlance, thereby be materially 'debunked'?

Dr. Vlachos is at his best in the realm of abstract thought, and his chapters on Religion, Morality, and Science and Philosophy are particularly illuminating. He is less happy when he deals with Greek art. One is surprised to read (356) that we have more extant copies of the "Marble Faun" than of any other ancient work. There are at least seven or eight times as many copies of the *Venus Genetrix*. The author states dogmatically (356) that we have in the *Hermes of Olympia* a Praxitelean original. This view is generally rejected nowadays, and the question which concerns the statue is rather, At what date and under what circumstances was the copy executed? The *Apollo Sauroktonos* is not "spearing" (356) a lizard, but playing with it. The "Socrates" of the British Museum (383) is of somewhat doubtful authenticity and has recently been relegated by the Museum authorities to an obscure corner. The "Sophocles" of the Lateran Museum (237) is probably an unknown orator. The photograph of the *Demosthenes* of the Vatican (315) is an old one; the false restoration of hands and scroll has recently been removed. One is glad, on the other hand, to see a recent picture of the Parthenon reproduced in the Frontispiece. It is wrong to speak of the background of Attic red-figured vases as covered with a black "slip" (340). One fears that, if slip had been used, the vases in question would have presented a very sorry appearance. "Polycletus" appears consistently in place of 'Polyclitus'. The well-known cylix of Exekias at Munich is in the Pinakothek, not in the Glyptothek, as is stated on page 161.

The list of infelicities that occur in this field might easily be extended. But the book, none the less, is a good one. There is sound good sense behind it and it makes pleasant reading. Had it appeared a dozen years ago, it would have taken a high rank. But as so many classicists and historians have been setting their hand, of recent years, to a task similar to that of Dr. Vlachos, *Hellas and Hellenism* inevitably suffers from the press of competition.

UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

A. D. FRASER